

REMARKS

Claims 13 and 16-41 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belotserkovsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,621,857; hereinafter "Belotserkovsky") in view of Levin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,654,979; hereinafter "Levin").

Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite "a master control unit including a time slot table and a partial sum table for any time slot granularity." Similarly, independent claim 28 has been amended to recite wherein the master control unit configures and controls the data cache and the signal processing elements for any time slot granularity." Similarly, independent claim 37 has been amended to recite a master control means ... for configuring and controlling the data cache and the signal processing means for any time slot granularity." Support for these amendments may be found in the published application, for example, at paragraphs 0030 and 0031.

Levin performs time sliced processing at symbol boundary while the claimed time-sliced processor performs time sliced processing for any time slot granularity, such as at chip or sub-chip boundary. Although it may seem to a person who is not of ordinary skill in the art of spread spectrum communication systems that knowing time-sliced processing at symbol boundary would make time-sliced processing at other granularities, such as chip or sub-chip boundary, obvious. However, since one symbol is the result of operations on multiple chips, doing time-sliced processing at symbol boundary is a different problem to solve from doing time-sliced processing at these other granularities.

Thus, independent claims 13, 28, and 37, along with dependent claims 16-27, 29-36, and 38-41, are patentable over the applied references for at least this reason.

To further define the invention, Applicant has added new dependent claims 42, 44, and 46, which each recite that the time slot granularity is at chip boundary, and added new claims 43, 45, and 47, which each recite wherein the time slot granularity is at sub-chip boundary. Support for these amendments may be found in the published application, for example, at paragraphs 0030 and

0031. These features are not suggested by the applied references. Thus dependent claims 42-47 are patentable over the applied references for the additional reason.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By *Laura C. Brutman*

Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicant